The Faculty Senate Committee on Research:

2021 Faculty Research Survey
**Background**

- FSRC “Faculty Research Survey” (Faculty Senate Committee on Research & Office of Research Administration)
  - Eddie Bolden Interim Director, Institutional Research Office
  - Joan Schenkel Associate Vice President for Research
  - Research Deans

- Objectives of the survey:
  1. Assess faculty satisfaction with research support services
  2. Identify priorities for improving research support
  3. Collect open-ended responses

- Outcomes:
  - Identify specific areas for improvement
  - Make recommendations
  - Establish a framework to monitor progress
2015 Survey
• Survey timeframe: April 30 – May 21, 2015
• Qualtrics
• N=393
• Response rate: 11%
  (N=3384)

2016 Survey
• Survey timeframe: Nov. 3 – Dec. 27, 2016
• Qualtrics
• N=604
• Response rate 17%
  (N=3470)

2021 Survey
• Survey timeframe: April 16 – May 18, 2021
• Qualtrics
• N=527 (735 started)
• Response rate: 15%
2021 Faculty Research Survey

Quantitative Data
Sample:
Primary faculty appointment at CWRU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine*</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences**</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weatherhead School of Management</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case School of Engineering</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances Payne Bolton School of Nursing</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Dental Medicine</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack, Joseph, and Morton Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* SOM divided by Basic Science & Clinical Medicine
** CAS divided by Social Sciences, Arts & Humanities, & Physics / Natural Sciences
• 50% Tenured
• 15% “Clinical faculty”
• 70% Main campus
• 7% HEC
Proposal Submission Over the last 3 years

**Proposals Submitted**

- More than 16: 0
- Between 11 and 15: 7%
- Between 6 and 10: 25%
- Between 1 and 5: 43%
- None: 20%

**Purpose of Proposal Submission**

- To support my creative endeavors: 20%
- To support my scholarship: 10%
- To fund my research: 60%

**Average Frequency of Proposal Submission**

- 3 or more times per year: 20%
- More than once per year: 30%
- 2 or 3 times in the past 3 years: 25%
- Once in the past 3 years: 15%
- I have never submitted a proposal: 0%
Top 5 Administrative Resource Faculty Would Find Most Helpful For Proposal Submission

- Research computing services
- The CWRU Writing Center
- Mentorship from senior faculty
- Scientific writing or editing services (internal or external)
- Internal scientific review or commentary
- Graphics support for figures and tables
- Templates or writing for non-science parts (e.g., facilities, environment)
- A proposal writing training program
- Administrative support for putting together the non-science parts of the grant (e.g., letters, biosketches)
- Administrative support for budget preparation
- More grant writing seminars/cohorts
Research Compliance Knowledge

Institutional Review Board (IRB)
- 11% I don't know them at all
- 12% I don't know much about them
- 35% I know some about them
- 42% I know a lot about them

Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC)
- 29% I don't know them at all
- 14% I don't know much about them
- 29% I know some about them
- 28% I know a lot about them

Animal Research Facility (ARC)
- 30% I don't know them at all
- 18% I don't know much about them
- 20% I know some about them
- 32% I know a lot about them

Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC)
- 35% I don't know them at all
- 26% I don't know much about them
- 29% I know some about them
- 10% I know a lot about them

Conflict of Interest Committee (COI)
- 17% I don't know them at all
- 27% I don't know much about them
- 41% I know some about them
- 14% I know a lot about them
Core Facilities

39% of Faculty Used Core Facility  (N=200)
44% Of Faculty Believe CWRU has all the core services and instrumentation needed

Top 15 Utilized Core Facilities

1. Animal Research Facility (ARC)
2. Genomics Core Facility
3. Imaging Research Core
4. Light Microscopy Imaging Core
5. Cytometry & Imaging Microscopy Core
6. Proteomics and Small Molecule Mass Spectrometry Core
7. Cryo-Electron Microscopy Core Facility
8. Applied Functional Genomics Core
9. Scientific Instrument Repair Center
10. CFAR Immune Function Core
11. Transgenic and Targeting Core Facility
12. Tissue Resource Core
13. MORE Center
14. Gene Expression and Genotyping Facility
15. Swagelok Center for Surface Analysis of Materials
Centers and Institutes

36% of Faculty involved with Center or Institute (N=188)

Center and Institute Engagement

- I AM NOT INVOLVED WITH A CENTER OR INSTITUTE: 8
- TO PREPARE AND SUBMIT PROPOSALS FOR FUNDING: 98
- TO PURSUE CREATIVE ENDEAVORS: 59
- TO CONDUCT SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES: 112
- TO CONDUCT RESEARCH: 139
- TO ATTEND SEMINARS AND/OR SYMPOSIA: 140
Institutional Review Board

40% IRB Utilization (N=211)

IRB Satisfaction

- Amount of time from protocol submission to approval
- Support from staff on the submission and review of...
- Training materials
- System for submitting protocols
- Overall satisfaction with the IRB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRB Satisfaction</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training materials</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System for submitting protocols</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall satisfaction with the IRB</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IRB Approval Timeframe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Full IRB review</th>
<th>Expedited review</th>
<th>Confirmation of exemption as human subjects research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2 WEEKS</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 WEEKS</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7 WEEKS</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8+ WEEKS</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Full IRB review
- Expedited review
- Confirmation of exemption as human subjects research
Compliance Committee Summary
For Each Committee Percentage of Very Satisfied and Satisfied Reported

Conflict of Interest Committee
• Overall –75%
• System for Submitting Disclosures- 57%
• Directions for Submission-63%
• Clarity of Submission Requirements-59%

CWRU Institutional Biosafety Committee
• Overall –75%
• System for Submitting Protocols- 60%
• Training Material- 63%
• Support from Staff- 77%
• Protocol Processing Time-67%

CWRU Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee
• Overall –90%
• System for Submitting Protocols- 78%
• Training Materials- 80%
• Support from Staff- 85%
Overall, the Office of Grants & Contracts

- Submission of Just In Time materials (Materials requested by funding agency prior to award – Other support page, ...)
  - Very Satisfied: 27%
  - Satisfied: 52%
  - Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied: 13%
  - Dissatisfied: 13%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 2%

- Setting up accounts (i.e., “speedtypes”)
  - Very Satisfied: 21%
  - Satisfied: 51%
  - Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied: 16%
  - Dissatisfied: 16%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 2%

- Processing progress and final scientific reports (RPPR)
  - Very Satisfied: 28%
  - Satisfied: 42%
  - Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied: 22%
  - Dissatisfied: 13%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 2%

- Contract/agreement negotiation and execution with state and local government
  - Very Satisfied: 23%
  - Satisfied: 44%
  - Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied: 21%
  - Dissatisfied: 18%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 2%

- Contract/agreement negotiation and execution with foundations
  - Very Satisfied: 23%
  - Satisfied: 47%
  - Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied: 16%
  - Dissatisfied: 18%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 2%

- Contract/agreement negotiation and execution for subawards
  - Very Satisfied: 25%
  - Satisfied: 39%
  - Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied: 18%
  - Dissatisfied: 13%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 2%

- Contract/agreement negotiation and execution with industry
  - Very Satisfied: 22%
  - Satisfied: 36%
  - Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied: 16%
  - Dissatisfied: 13%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 2%

- Understanding sponsor/agency guidelines
  - Very Satisfied: 25%
  - Satisfied: 45%
  - Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied: 21%
  - Dissatisfied: 13%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 2%

- Proposal submission
  - Very Satisfied: 29%
  - Satisfied: 50%
  - Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied: 13%
  - Dissatisfied: 13%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 2%

- Overall, the Office of Grants & Contracts
  - Very Satisfied: 25%
  - Satisfied: 52%
  - Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied: 14%
  - Dissatisfied: 13%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 2%
Overall, the Office of Corporate Relations

- Understanding sponsor guidelines: 25% Very Satisfied, 30% Satisfied, 25% Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied, 15% Dissatisfied, 5% Very Dissatisfied
- Budget preparation: 11% Very Satisfied, 33% Satisfied, 28% Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied, 22% Dissatisfied, 6% Very Dissatisfied
- Negotiation with funder: 16% Very Satisfied, 32% Satisfied, 16% Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied, 26% Dissatisfied, 11% Very Dissatisfied
- Finding funding opportunities: 26% Very Satisfied, 35% Satisfied, 17% Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied, 13% Dissatisfied, 9% Very Dissatisfied
- Proposal preparation support: 25% Very Satisfied, 35% Satisfied, 20% Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied, 5% Dissatisfied, 15% Very Dissatisfied

Overall, the Office of Corporate Relations: 21% Very Satisfied, 46% Satisfied, 17% Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied, 4% Dissatisfied, 13% Very Dissatisfied

Overall, the Office of Foundation Relations

- Grant reports (post-award): 30% Very Satisfied, 36% Satisfied, 15% Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied, 7% Dissatisfied, 8% Very Dissatisfied
- Building relationships with the funder (e.g.,...): 34% Very Satisfied, 35% Satisfied, 17% Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied, 4% Dissatisfied, 7% Very Dissatisfied
- Understanding sponsor guidelines: 37% Very Satisfied, 46% Satisfied, 7% Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied, 4% Dissatisfied, 7% Very Dissatisfied
- Budget review: 36% Very Satisfied, 34% Satisfied, 21% Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied, 4% Dissatisfied, 7% Very Dissatisfied
- Finding funding opportunities: 36% Very Satisfied, 39% Satisfied, 8% Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied, 4% Dissatisfied, 7% Very Dissatisfied
- Proposal preparation support: 41% Very Satisfied, 36% Satisfied, 7% Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied, 4% Dissatisfied, 7% Very Dissatisfied

Overall, the Office of Foundation Relations: 38% Very Satisfied, 42% Satisfied, 8% Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied, 4% Dissatisfied, 8% Very Dissatisfied
Management Center or Department Proposal Submission and Project Set-Up Support

Overall, support provided by your school

Submission of progress and final scientific reports
Setting up accounts (i.e., “speedtypes”)
Understanding sponsor / agency guidelines
Administrative support for the non-science part of proposals (letters, resources, etc.)
Keeping up-to-date on research news and sponsor guidelines and policies
Budget preparation
Finding funding opportunities
Proposal preparation support
Proposal submission

Very Satisfied  Satisfied  Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied  Dissatisfied  Very Dissatisfied
## Office Sponsored Projects Administration Post-Award Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submission of agency-specific requirements for the close-out or management of awards (XTrain)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project close-out (financial report)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing sub-awards</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of invoices to funders</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording and crediting of payments received by sponsors for research activities</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring accounts</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall, Sponsored Projects Administration Post-Award Services</strong></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 2016- 2021 Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2016 Satisfied</th>
<th>2021 Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submitting proposals</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>SOM- 78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OSPA- 67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Management Center- 55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing proposal budgets</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>Management Centers-52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Industry Relations-44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding sponsor / agency guidelines</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Management Centers-48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB submission / review processes</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiating contracts</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>OSPA Industry-35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OSPA Sub-Award-45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OSPA Foundations-45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OSPA Government-41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OG&amp;C Industry-57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OG&amp;C Sub-Award-64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OG&amp;C Foundations-79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OG&amp;C Government-67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying industry support opportunities</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project reporting</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>OSPA-52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OG&amp;C-70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project closeout activities</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>OSPA Final Report- 56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OSPA Agency Specific- 51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment and invoicing issues</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring accounts</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technology Transfer Activities

Technology Transfer Level of Satisfaction N=97

- **Material Transfer Agreement**: 100%
- **Data Use Agreement**: 78%
- **Licensing**: 30%
- **Patent Application**: 58%
- **Invention disclosure**: 88%

**Technology Transfer Level of Satisfaction**

- **Amount of time from submission to approval**
  - Very Satisfied: 8%
  - Satisfied: 34%
  - Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied: 22%
  - Dissatisfied: 20%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 16%

- **Transparency and communication of office staff**
  - Very Satisfied: 11%
  - Satisfied: 35%
  - Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied: 17%
  - Dissatisfied: 22%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 15%

- **Support from staff on the submission and revision**
  - Very Satisfied: 14%
  - Satisfied: 36%
  - Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied: 19%
  - Dissatisfied: 22%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 9%

- **System for submitting documents for review**
  - Very Satisfied: 9%
  - Satisfied: 45%
  - Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied: 19%
  - Dissatisfied: 18%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 9%
Data Use Agreements N= 137

- Amount of time from submission to approval:
  - Very Satisfied: 7%
  - Satisfied: 29%
  - Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied: 16%
  - Dissatisfied: 25%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 22%

- Transparency and communication of office staff:
  - Very Satisfied: 11%
  - Satisfied: 38%
  - Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied: 25%
  - Dissatisfied: 16%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 10%

- Support from staff on the submission and revision:
  - Very Satisfied: 13%
  - Satisfied: 42%
  - Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied: 18%
  - Dissatisfied: 17%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 10%

- System for submitting documents for review:
  - Very Satisfied: 8%
  - Satisfied: 38%
  - Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied: 25%
  - Dissatisfied: 18%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 10%
### General Faculty Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance venues</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio facilities</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The book buying fund</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel funds</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sabbatical policy</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teaching release policy</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The extent to which you feel your research, scholarship or creative endeavors are valued

- **Undervalued**
- **Valued appropriately**
- **Too highly valued**

- Your school or management center
- Your department
Kelvin Smith Library and the Freedman Center for Digital Scholarship

Services

- Self-service video recording
- Project consultation
- Open Access consultation
- Multimedia production consultation
- Instruction (workshops and in-class sessions)
- GIS (Geospatial data and mapping)
- Funding opportunities (Freedman Fellows program, ...)
- Digitization (public service, premium service and ...)
- Digital Case (open access institutional repository)
- Data management support (Open Science...)
- Copyright, fair use and publishing consultation
- Consultation and assistance services

Which campus library do you primarily use for your research?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kelvin Smith Library (including OhioLINK)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Education Campus Library</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen Memorial Library</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris Library (MSASS)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben C. Greene Library (Law)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you feel your campus library has adequate content (e.g., journals, books, media, databases, etc.) for your research?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, it definitely does</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It often does, but with some gaps</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It often does not, with many gaps</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, it definitely does</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>